

Next-Order Estimate of Higgs $\rightarrow$ Two-Gluon Rate

F. A. Chishtie*, V. Elias*, T. G. Steele†

**Department of Applied Mathematics, The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario N6A 5B7 Canada.*

*†Department of Physics and Engineering Physics, University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 5E2 Canada.*

Abstract. Using asymptotic Padé approximant methods, we have calculated the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$ contribution to the Standard-Model $H \rightarrow gg$ decay rate. This process is of particular interest because of the slow convergence evident from the known terms of its QCD series. The $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$ term is expressed as a 3rd degree polynomial in $L \equiv \ln\left(\frac{\mu^2}{m_t^2(\mu)}\right)$. We find that the asymptotic Padé predictions for the renormalization-group accessible coefficients of L , L^2 and L^3 are within 1%, 2% and 7% of their respective values. The inclusion of the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$ contribution renders the full decay rate virtually scale independent over the entire $0.3M_H \leq \mu \leq M_t$ range of the renormalization scale μ .

INTRODUCTION

The Higgs boson remains the only missing particle within the Standard Model of particle physics. One of the principal hadronic decay modes for a Weinberg-Salam Higgs (of mass $100 - 175 \text{ GeV}$) is the Higgs $\rightarrow 2$ gluon ($H \rightarrow gg$) process, a process whose leading (one-loop) contribution is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$. The two known subleading contributions exhibit very slow convergence: e.g. the decay of an $M_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$ Standard-Model Higgs is characterized by the following perturbative series[1]:

$$1 + 0.66 + 0.21.$$

The present paper is directed towards an estimate of the next order (i.e., four-loop) contribution of the $H \rightarrow gg$ process by using renormalization group (RG) and asymptotic Padé-approximant methods similar to those employed in [2] for next-order terms in correlation functions, and in [3] for the case of a (non-Standard-Model) CP-odd Higgs decay into two gluons. In the analysis of this latter process, we obtained Padé-approximant estimates of RG-accessible coefficients of next-order perturbation theory that are accurate to within a few percent, providing support for the Padé-predicted RG-inaccessible coefficient still needed for an estimate of the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$ contribution. In the present work, we derive the RG accessible coefficients of the Standard-Model $H \rightarrow gg$ rate within an $\overline{MS}$ framework with six

active flavours [1]. RG invariance allows us to calculate all the coefficients c_k of $\ln^k \left[\frac{\mu^2}{m_t^2(\mu)} \right]$ except for the constant ($k = 0$) term. We then demonstrate how Padé approximant methods may be utilized to estimate the full $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$ contribution to the decay rate, and show that such estimates of the RG-accessible coefficients are quite close to their true values. Finally, we discuss how incorporation of the estimated four-loop term eliminates virtually all residual scale- (μ -) dependence in the overall $H \rightarrow gg$ rate.

RG-ACCESSIBLE COEFFICIENTS OF THE $H \rightarrow gg$ RATE

The $H \rightarrow gg$ decay rate is given by the following perturbative expression in the $4M_t^2 \gg M_H^2 \gg M_b^2$ limit [1,4]:

$$\Gamma_{H \rightarrow gg} = \frac{\sqrt{2}G_F M_H^3}{72\pi} S \left[x^{(6)}(\mu), L(\mu), T \right], \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S[x, L, T] = & x^2 \left(1 + x \left[\left(\frac{215}{12} - \frac{23T}{6} \right) + \frac{7}{2}L \right] \right. \\ & + x^2 \left[\left(146.8912 - \frac{4903}{48}T + \frac{529}{48}T^2 \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \left(\frac{1445}{16} - \frac{161}{8}T \right) L + \frac{147}{16}L^2 \right] \\ & \left. + x^3 \left[c_0 + c_1 L + c_2 L^2 + c_3 L^3 \right] + \mathcal{O}(x^4) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The rate (1) is expressed entirely in terms of a scale-dependent t -quark mass and coupling constant characterised by six active flavours via $L(\mu) \equiv \ln \left(\frac{\mu^2}{m_t^2(\mu)} \right)$ and $x^{(6)}(\mu) = \alpha_s^{(6)}(\mu)/\pi$. The constant $T \equiv \ln \left(\frac{M_H^2}{M_t^2} \right)$ involves a scale-independent ratio of propagator-pole Higgs and t -quark masses [4]. The coefficients c_i in (2) characterize the unknown 4th loop contribution to the decay rate. Three of these unknown coefficients [c_1, c_2, c_3] can be extracted via the RG-invariance of the physical decay rate:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mu^2 \frac{dS}{d\mu^2} [x, L, T], \\ &= [1 - 2\gamma_m(x)] \frac{\partial S}{\partial L} + \beta(x) \frac{\partial S}{\partial x}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The β and γ_m functions for six active flavours are given by

$$\beta^{(6)}(x) = -\frac{7}{4}x^2 - \frac{13}{8}x^3 + \frac{65}{128}x^4 \dots \quad (4)$$

$$\gamma_m^{(6)}(x) = -x - \frac{27}{8}x^2 \dots \quad (5)$$

One can verify that (3) is valid order by order to known terms in (2). The continued validity to orders $x^5 L^2$, $x^5 L$ and x^5 yield values for c_1, c_2 and c_3 :

$$c_1 = 910.3167 - \frac{16643}{24}T + \frac{3703}{48}T^2, \quad c_2 = \frac{1225}{4} - \frac{1127}{16}T, \quad c_3 = \frac{343}{16}. \quad (6)$$

In the following section, we will utilize asymptotic Padé approximation procedure to estimate $\{c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3\}$. The ability to predict known coefficients will serve to test the appropriateness of this procedure for estimating the RG-inaccessible coefficient c_0 .

PADÉ PREDICTIONS FOR FOUR-LOOP COEFFICIENTS

The series $S[x, L, T]$ in (2) may be expressed as follows:

$$S[x, L, T] = x^2 \left[1 + R_1[L, T]x + R_2[L, T]x^2 + R_3[L, T]x^3 + \dots \right], \quad (7)$$

where

$$R_1[L, T] = \left(\frac{215}{12} - \frac{23}{6}T \right) + \frac{7}{2}L, \quad (8)$$

$$R_2[L, T] = 146.8912 - \frac{4903}{48}T + \frac{529}{48}T^2 + \left(\frac{1445}{16} - \frac{161}{8}T \right)L + \frac{147}{16}L^2, \quad (9)$$

$$R_3[L, T] = c_0(T) + c_1(T)L + c_2(T)L^2 + c_3L^3. \quad (10)$$

As discussed in prior work [2, 3, 5] and in another contribution to these Proceedings,¹ Padé-approximant methods may be utilized in order to predict that

$$R_3[L] = 2R_2^3[L]/(R_1[L]R_2[L] + R_1^3[L]) \quad (11)$$

To obtain c_1, c_2, c_3 , we match the scale dependence of (10) to that of (11) over the $L > 0$ region [ultraviolet scales of $\mu > M_t(\mu)$] by optimizing the least squares function

$$\chi^2[c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3] = \int_0^1 \left[R_3 - (c_0 - c_1 \ln w + c_2 \ln^2 w - c_3 \ln^3 w) \right]^2 dw, \quad (12)$$

as in our prior contribution to this Proceedings,¹ with $w = \frac{m_t^2(\mu)}{\mu^2}$ [$L = -\ln(w)$], and with R_3 given by (11). For $M_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ($T = -1.126$), we find that

$$\chi^2(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3)$$

¹See “Reducing the Theoretical Uncertainty in the Extraction of $|V_{ub}| \dots$ ” in this volume.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 4.064168878 \cdot 10^7 + 720c_3^2 + 4c_0c_2 + c_0^2 + 2c_0c_1 + 24c_2^2 + 12c_1c_2 + 12c_0c_3 + 2c_1^2 \\
&+ 240c_2c_3 + 48c_1c_3 - 10205.87c_0 - 17507.05c_1 - 54106.23c_2 - 234536.67c_3. \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

Optimization requires that

$$\frac{\partial \chi^2}{\partial c_i} = 0 \quad (14)$$

which yields the following predicted values:

$$c_0^{\chi^2} = 2452, \quad c_1^{\chi^2} = 1774, \quad c_2^{\chi^2} = 377.2, \quad c_3^{\chi^2} = 20.45, \quad (15)$$

The corresponding true values of the RG-accessible coefficients (6) when $M_H = 100 \text{ GeV}$ are

$$c_1 = 1789.02, \quad c_2 = 385.568, \quad c_3 = 21.4375. \quad (16)$$

indicative of the accuracy of the estimation procedure leading to (15). In Table 1, a tabulated set of predictions of the four loop term c_0 is given for M_H between 100 and 175 GeV . Relative errors of c_1 and c_2 are seen to remain within 2% over the range of M_H given; c_3 is seen to be within 7% of its true value for the same range.

The results for c_0 , as tabulated in Table 1, can be utilized to predict c_0 as a degree-3 polynomial in T :

$$c_0(T) = 755.9 - 1029T + 394.3T^2 - 26.74T^3. \quad (17)$$

This prediction, as obtained via Padé-approximant methods, can be coupled with c_3 and the known T -dependence (6) of $c_1(T)$ and $c_2(T)$ to predict the full four-loop contribution (10) to $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$, the scale-sensitive (i.e., μ -dependent) portion (7) of the $H \rightarrow gg$ rate (1).

Surprisingly, the scale-dependence of $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$ is virtually eliminated upon incorporation of the estimated four-loop contribution to the rate. In Table 2, this scale-sensitive portion of the $H \rightarrow gg$ rate is evaluated for $M_H = 125 \text{ GeV}$ for selected values of the scale parameter μ between 38 and 175 GeV . The four-loop term R_3x^3 , as defined by (10) to include the $M_H = 125 \text{ GeV}$ Padé estimate $c_0 = 1646$ from Table 1, varies from zero to 7% of the leading term in the perturbative series within $S[x, L, T]$, depending on the choice for μ . Nevertheless, $S[x, L, T]$ displays a relative error of 0.6% over this same range of μ , suggesting that the Padé estimate for c_0 is precisely what is required to remove virtually all residual scale- (μ -) dependence from the four-loop-order decay rate.

$M_H(GeV)^1$	c_0^{pr}	c_1^{pr}	c_1^{RG}	c_2^{pr}	c_2^{RG}	c_3^{pr}	c_3^{RG}
100	2453	1772	1789	378.4	385.6	20.27	21.44
125	1646	1405	1417	349.6	354.1	20.17	21.44
150	1120	1126	1137	326.2	328.4	20.07	21.44
175	763.2	903.7	915.1	306.6	306.7	19.98	21.44

TABLE 1: Predicted (pr) and true (RG) values (as determined by renormalization- group methods) for four-loop coefficients of the $H \rightarrow gg$ decay rate, as obtained via the moment approach of ref. [4]. Least- squares predictions, as in (15) for $M_H = 100 GeV$ are virtually identical to those of the moment approach, which also depend on the asymptotic Padé prediction (11) for the four-loop term.

μ (GeV)	$\alpha_s(\mu)$	$m_t(\mu)$ (GeV)	$1 + R_1x + R_2x^2 + R_3x^3$	$S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$
38	0.1353	200.9	$1 + 0.3818 - 0.0439 + 0.0026$	0.002486
66	0.1245	190.6	$1 + 0.5192 + 0.0658 - 0.0000$	0.002490
80.5	0.1211	187.3	$1 + 0.5631 + 0.1067 + 0.0074$	0.002491
125	0.1141	180.4	$1 + 0.6526 + 0.1986 + 0.0367$	0.002486
175	0.1092	175.6	$1 + 0.7127 + 0.2668 + 0.0676$	0.002475

TABLE 2: Virtual scale invariance of $H \rightarrow gg$ four-loop estimated rate when $M_H = 125 GeV$. $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is assumed to evolve from $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.119$ [6], and $m_t(\mu)$ is assumed to evolve from $m_t(m_t) \cong M_t = 175.6 GeV$. The order-by-order perturbation series within the decay rate, as defined by (7), as well as $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$, the scale-sensitive portion of the rate (1), are listed for representative values of μ between $M_H/3$ and M_t . Although the predicted four loop term R_3x^3 varies between zero and seven percent of the lead (one-loop) term in the series, the scale-sensitive portion of the rate $S[x, L, T]$ is constant up to $|\Delta S/S| = 0.6\%$.

μ (GeV)	$\alpha_s(\mu)$	$m_t(\mu)$ (GeV)	$1 + R_1x + R_2x^2 + R_3x^3$	$S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$
47	0.1309	196.8	$1 + 0.3793 - 0.0378 + 0.0023$	0.002334
78.5	0.1215	187.7	$1 + 0.5036 + 0.0589 + 0.0000$	0.002337
95.5	0.1183	184.6	$1 + 0.5463 + 0.0973 + 0.0064$	0.002338
150	0.1114	177.8	$1 + 0.6360 + 0.1866 + 0.0333$	0.002334
175	0.1092	175.6	$1 + 0.6641 + 0.2170 + 0.0458$	0.002330

TABLE 3: Virtual scale invariance of $H \rightarrow gg$ four-loop estimated rate when $M_H = 150 GeV$. Running of $\alpha_s(\mu)$ and $m_t(\mu)$, as well as the perturbative series $1 + R_1x + \dots$ within $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$, the scale-sensitive portion of the rate (1), are as in Table 2. Although the four-loop term R_3x^3 grows to be 4.6% of the leading term (unity) in the series, the rate itself is seen to exhibit a relative error $|\Delta S/S| \lesssim 0.3\%$ over the range $M_H/3 \lesssim \mu \lesssim M_t$.

M_H (GeV)	$\mu^{(MS)}$ (GeV)	$\delta_m(\mu^{MS})$	$R_3x^3(\mu^{MS})$	$\Gamma(H \rightarrow gg)$ (GeV)
100	65.5	-0.059	+ 0.0089	$1.90 \cdot 10^{-4}$
125	80.5	-0.015	+ 0.0074	$3.52 \cdot 10^{-4}$
150	95.5	+0.023	+ 0.0064	$5.83 \cdot 10^{-4}$
175	111	+0.077	+ 0.0309	$9.08 \cdot 10^{-4}$

TABLE 4: Incorporation of Mass-corrections $\delta_m(\mu^{MS})$ to the perturbative series (22) in the predicted Standard-Model $H \rightarrow gg$ decay rate for various choices of M_H , as described in the text. The “minimal sensitivity” choice of scale (μ^{MS}) represents a (very weak) local maximum of $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$ prior to the incorporation of mass-corrections. The magnitude of the leading mass correction δ_m is shown to be several times larger than the estimated four-loop correction R_3x^3 , although it is generally smaller than the known three-loop correction R_2x^2 .

This reduction in scale dependence is even more dramatic as M_H increases to 150 GeV , as is evident from Table 3. Incorporation of the Padé estimate $c_0 = 1120$ (Table 1) into R_3x^3 , as defined by (10) [with RG-values (6) for $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$], leads to a four-loop expression for the rate characterised by a relative error $|\Delta S/S| \leq 0.3\%$ over values of the scale parameter μ chosen between 47 and 175 GeV . It must be noted that c_0 ’s contribution to $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$ is just $c_0x^3(\mu)$, in itself an appreciably scale-dependent contribution. The absence of any concomitant scale dependence in S , despite its potentially large contribution from an arbitrary choice of c_0 , demonstrates the success of the Padé estimate for c_0 in controlling potentially large residual scale sensitivity in the $H \rightarrow gg$ rate.

LEADING FERMION MASS CORRECTIONS

The rate (1) has implicit within its lead term the assumption that $M_H^2 \ll 4M_t^2$ [1]. Physical departures from this assumption, while small compared to the three-loop contribution to the $H \rightarrow gg$ rate as calculated in [1], are in fact somewhat larger than the four-loop contributions estimated above. These fermion mass corrections are most easily incorporated by replacing the leading factor of unity in the series $1 + R_1x + R_2x^2 + R_3x^3$ with the following departure from the assumed $m_b^2 \ll M_H^2 \ll 4M_t^2$ hierarchy of masses [4,7]:

$$1 \rightarrow \frac{9}{16} \left[(A_t + ReA_b)^2 + (ImA_b)^2 \right] \equiv 1 + \delta_m(\mu) \quad (18)$$

$$A_t = 2 \left[\tau_t + (\tau_t - 1) \left(\sin^{-1}(\sqrt{\tau_t}) \right)^2 \right] / \tau_t^2, \quad \tau_t \equiv M_H^2 / 4m_t^2(\mu), \quad (19)$$

$$A_b = 2 \left[\tau_b + (\tau_b - 1)f(\tau_b) \right] / \tau_b^2, \quad \tau_b \equiv M_H^2 / 4m_b^2(\mu), \quad (20)$$

$$f(\tau) \equiv -\frac{1}{4} \left[\ln \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 1/\tau}}{1 - \sqrt{1 - 1/\tau}} \right) - i\pi \right]^2. \quad (21)$$

We (somewhat arbitrarily) choose the scale μ to be the “minimal- sensitivity” [8] maximum (μ^{MS}) of $S[x(\mu), L(\mu), T]$, which is seen to occur at values of μ tabulated in Table 4 for various choices of M_H . The values for $m_b(\mu^{MS})$ and $m_t(\mu^{MS})$ utilized in (19) and (20) are evolved from reference values $m_t(m_t) = 175.6 \text{ GeV}$, $m_b(m_b) = 4.2 \text{ GeV}$ [6]. The leading mass correction $\delta_m(\mu^{MS})$, as obtained from (18-21), is tabulated and compared to the corresponding estimate of the four-loop term $R_3 x^3(\mu^{MS})$ in Table 4. These mass corrections are clearly seen to dominate over the four-loop term in the scale-sensitive portion of the $H \rightarrow gg$ rate, which is now given by

$$S[x(\mu^{MS}), L(\mu^{MS}), T] = x^2(\mu^{MS}) \left[1 + \delta_m(\mu^{MS}) + R_1 x(\mu^{MS}) + R_2 x^2(\mu^{MS}) + R_3 x^3(\mu^{MS}) \right]. \quad (22)$$

Predictions for the full Standard Model $H \rightarrow gg$ rate that are inclusive of these mass corrections are also listed in Table 4. Although these leading mass corrections are two to six times as large as the estimated four-loop correction, they are seen to be smaller (in general) than the three-loop corrections $R_2 x^2(\mu^{MS})$. Moreover, subsequent *subleading* departures from the $m_b^2 \ll M_H^2 \ll 4M_t^2$ mass hierarchy are anticipated to be $\mathcal{O}(x\delta_m)$, which should be comparable to or somewhat smaller than the four-loop terms listed in Table 4. Note that $|\delta_m(\mu^{MS})|$ is itself only $\sim 2\%$ of the leading term (i.e., unity) in the perturbative series for the $M_H = 125$ and 150 GeV cases, as evident from Table 4, thereby providing justification for the three-digit accuracy of the $H \rightarrow gg$ predicted rates for these cases.

REFERENCES

1. Chetyrkin, K.G., Kniehl, B.A., and Steinhauser, M., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 353 (1997).
2. Chishtie, F., Elias, V., and Steele, T.G. *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 105013 (1999).
3. Chishtie, F.A., Elias, V., and Steele, T.G., *J. Phys. G* **26**, 93 (2000).
4. Chishtie, F.A., Elias, V., and Steele, T.G., *J. Phys. G* **26** (to appear: hep-ph/0004140).
5. Elias, V., Steele, T.G., Chishtie, F., Migneron, R., and Sprague, K., *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 116007 (1998).
6. Caso, C. et. al. [Particle Data Group], *Eur. Phys. J. C* **3**, 1 (1998).
7. Spira, M., Djouadi, A., Graudens, D., and Zerwas, P.M., *Nucl. Phys. B* **453**, 17 (1995).
8. Stevenson, P.M., *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 2916 (1981).